

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 7, 2005, and the cited art have been carefully considered. The recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13 is gratefully acknowledged. The application has been amended to eliminate unnecessary limitations and to correct grammatical and similar errors. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested based on the amendments and following discussion.

OBJECTIONS:

The title was objected to for not being descriptive.

The title has been amended.

The drawings were objected to for not showing a reference sign (1) mentioned in the Specification.

The Specification has been amended.

The drawings were objected to for showing a reference sign (63) not mentioned in the Specification.

The Specification has been amended.

REJECTION 112:

1. Claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph.
Claims 2 and 7 were cited for not having antecedent basis for "the rim."
Claims 2 and 7 have been amended.

REJECTION 103:

2. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103 over Friedrichs US 5,744,901 in view of Work US 6,111,359.

The rejection of Claim 1 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the combination of Friedrichs '901 in view of Work '359 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

There appears to be a misunderstanding of the claim language. Claim 1 specifies in part:
"*...at least one metallic contact element that is designed as an angular contact lug being fastened on said outer side of the reflector body, wherein said reflector body consists of an electrically insulating plastic, and said at least one contact lug is fixed at least two different*

locations of said reflector body with the aid of claws or barbs that are integrally formed on said at least one contact lug. ”

It is common in the lamp art to refer to the electrical input for a lamp as the “contact” or as a “lug” where the contact is a sliding plug type contact. It is clear to those skilled in the lamp art the upstanding blades (lugs) 5, 6 shown in FIG. 1 are to be plugged onto for electrical connection. This is how similar lamps are commonly electrically connected. Claim 1 uses the common language of art for the structure shown in FIG. 1: “contact” means “electrical contact” and “lug” means “pluggable (blade or prong) contact”. Because these lugs 5, 6 are directly mounted on the plastic reflector (inherently electrically insulating), the lugs 5, 6 need not be insulated further.

Friedrichs ‘901 shows a lamp 10 mounted in a glass reflector 1. The reflector 1 is coupled to a tubular base extension 30 by a clip-ring 21 that includes barbs 26, 27. The lamp 10 is electrically connected by lead wires 12 and pins 31. There are no contact lugs shown or discussed in Friedrichs ‘901. The reflector is made of glass not plastic. The barbs 26, 27 referenced in the Office Action are not formed on a lug and do not couple a lug to the reflector 1. There is no suggestion in Friedrichs ‘901 to use a plastic reflector, to electrically connect the lamp with lugs, or to mount the lugs (non-existent) to the plastic (non-existent) reflector using cut-outs with barbs (not shown).

Work ‘359 also fails to show a plastic reflector, and fails to show any contact lugs or lugs with cutouts and barbs. Reflector 229 is glass, and the base 275 is a threaded base. There are simply no contact lugs shown or discussed in Work ‘359.

In combination Friedrich ‘901 and Work ‘359 cannot be said to show, teach or make obvious a plastic reflector supporting contact lugs having cutouts with barbs coupling to the lugs to the plastic reflector.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claim is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Krieg US 4,623,815 in view of Work US 6,111,359.

Krieg ‘815 shows a lug 16a coupled by a rivet 30 to a ceramic body 12 (including 12a) joined to a metal reflector 11.

Claim 6 specifies in part: “...wherein said reflector body consists of an electrically insulating plastic, and said at least one contact lug is fixed at least two different locations of said reflector body with the aid of claws or barbs that are integrally formed on said at least one contact lug. ”

There is no plastic reflector in Krieg '815.

There is a contact lug in Kreig '815, but it does not have claws or barbs, and is not fixed to the reflector by claws or barbs formed on the contact lug.

The rejection of Claims 6 and 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the combination of Krieg '815 in view of Work '359 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

BASE CLAIM REJECTION

4. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13 were objected to as being dependent from rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all limitations of the base claim, and any intervening claims. The relevant claims have been re-written in independent form.

It is believed that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made, that the Application as amended is patentably distinct over the cited art, and that the case is now in condition to be passed to issue. Reconsideration of the amended application is therefore requested, and an early favorable notice of allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: William E. Meyer

William E. Meyer

Reg. No. 30,719

Attorney for Applicants

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.

100 ENDICOTT STREET

DANVERS, MA 01923

(978) 750-2384

(978) 750-2045 FAX